IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO. 450 OF 2006

MRS. CONNIE GRACIAS ALIAS CONNIE MIRANDA, MARGAO GOA. ....Petitioner

Versus

SHRI ANTONIO GRACIAS, VARCA, SALCETE GOA. ....Respondent

Mr. Shivanand Singbal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.M.S.Usgaonkar, Sr. Advocate for the respondents.

Coram:- DR. S. RADHAKRISHNAN, J.

Date:- 19th October, 2006

P.C.

Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and the respondent.

By this petition, the petitioner is challenging the order dated 17.8.2006 whereby the application filed by the respondent dated 12.7.2006, seeking certain information from International Transport Workers Federation, London and Bank of Maharashtra (Mumbai) was allowed.

Now, Mr. Usgaonkar learned Counsel for the respondent fairly states that the respondent is not pressing the application regarding information from International Transport Workers Federation, London. However, he points out that the Bank of Maharashtra, Mumbai has furnished the information as per order dated 17.8.2006. In view thereof, nothing survives in the petition. However, the learned Counsel for the petitioner states that proper procedure was not followed in disclosure and contends that this document cannot be looked at all by the learned Trial Judge.

As the particulars have been already disclosed by Bank of

Maharashtra, nothing further survives in the Petition. Hence Petition stands dismissed.

However, it is made clear that the petitioner would be entitled to argue before the Trial Court, regarding admissibility of the particulars furnished by Bank of Maharashtra and also regarding the improper procedure of production of particulars.

DR. S. RADHAKRISHNAN, J.

ef.